

### **REMARKS**

The Final Office Action dated August 24, 2005 contained a final rejection of claims 1-20. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 13, and 19. Claims 1-20 are in the case. Please consider the present amendment with the attached Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This amendment is in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this case, the Applicant has removed the terms specifically objected to by the Examiner by amending claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, which the Applicant believes overcomes this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,800). The Office Action also rejected claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,800) in view of Hosein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,694).

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The Applicant's newly amended independent claims now include granting previously authorized non-controlling access to the device if the user is locally authenticated and then granting access to new activities and control parameters on the computer device if remote authentication is successful. Support for these newly amended features can be found in FIG. 3 and at paragraphs [0020], [0021], and [0031] of the Applicant's U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0093690 A1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0020], "[T]he client 10 provides for interaction with a "user" (not shown) **seeking authorization for certain activities, services, and/or resources** available on the system 1...In the example described here, authorization is provided by **granting or continuing access to some, or all**, of the computer system 1 via the client 10." *[emphasis added]*.

Also, paragraph [0021] states "[G]ranting or **continuing access** to these users would, respectively, allow the user to change **control parameters** (such as unlocking

the lock), access network resources, conduct banking transactions, or send communications.” Moreover, paragraph [0031] states “...if access has **already been granted** at step 110, then a **successful remote authentication will continue that access** before returning to step 102 where the system 1 continues working on the authorized activity. **During such authorized activities**, the client 10 may wait for a **new username and password** in order to begin a **new activity**, or the client may **simply deny access for any new activities** until the authorized activity is completed. The client 10 may also be configured to receive and/or store identification data from a subsequent user while the previous user’s activity is being completed.”

With regard to the anticipation rejection, unlike the Applicant’s claimed invention, Henry et al. merely disclose a system that can “...locally authenticate an arriving mobile...and thus grant temporary access...” (see col. 3, lines 2-5). Clearly, the system in Henry et al. does not grant previously authorized non-controlling access to the device if the user is locally authenticated and then grant access to new activities and control parameters on the computer device if remote authentication is successful, like the Applicant’s newly amended claims.

Instead, Henry et al. explicitly states that after local authentication, “...the mobile host 200 is temporarily enabled on the new access network, and thus can respectively send and receive packets to and from the network.” Thus, Henry et al. allows full access and does not provide previously authorized non-controlling access to the device if the user is locally authenticated and then grant access to new activities and control parameters on the computer device if remote authentication is successful, as claimed by the Applicant.

Hence, since the cited reference does not disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention, the reference cannot anticipate the claims. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

With regard to the obviousness rejection of claims 19-20, the combined references do not grant previously authorized non-controlling access if the user is locally authenticated and then grant access to new activities and control parameters on the computer device if remote authentication is successful and limit a number of times that a particular client database and/or record in any, or all, of the client databases will

Serial No.: 10/003,138  
Attorney Docket No.: 10008052-1

be updated during any period of time and/or total number of updates, like the Applicant's claimed invention.


Further, because the remaining dependent claims depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: November 25, 2005



Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicant  
(818) 885-1575 TEL  
(818) 885-5750 FAX